### **Historic, Archive Document**

Do not assume content reflects current scientific knowledge, policies, or practices.



A335 R882U

# UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE LIBRARY



BOOK NUMBER

A335 R882U

### UTAH 8 DUCHESNE

### FIELD APPRAISAL ANALYSIS

Prepared by
Economic Analysis Section
Electric Operations and Loans Division
RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION



Field Appraisal Completed in August 1953

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

\*



### SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION UTAH 8 DUCHESNE

### AREA CHARACTERISTICS

During the period 1930-1950, the combined total population of Duchesne and Uintah Counties increased by about 7 percent. The farm population during this period decreased by approximately 25 percent, while the nonfarm population increased by 12 percent.

About 35 percent of the land area in the two counties was classified as farm land in 1950. Of the total farm acreage, 86 percent was classified as land used for pasture. Average gross farm income in the two counties was \$3,960 in 1949. Ninety-two percent of the farm income in 1949 was derived from the sale of livestock and livestock products, and practically all of the remainder from the sale of crops. The average value of land and buildings in the two counties in 1950 was \$15,762, which was 76 percent higher than 5 years earlier. In 1950, 63 percent of the farms in the two counties were owned in full or in part. Fifty-five percent of the farmers worked off the farm in 1949, while about one-third worked 100 or more days off the farm. Approximately one-third of the farmers reported other income of the family exceeding the value of farm products sold in 1949. Local business establishments in the service area and the lumber, coal, mining, and oil industries operating in or near the service area provide a source of off-farm employment. The topography of the area is characterized by arid basin lands interspersed with mountain ranges, hills, benchlands, and rolling plains, both smooth and broken, with considerable irrigated and irrigable land. The soils range from gravelly loam on the benchlands to silty clay loam on the lower elevations.

#### ULTIMATE NUMBER OF CONSUMERS

On July 31, 1953, this cooperative was serving a total of 2,428 consumers. The manager has estimated that a total of 3,220 consumers will be served by 1963. From a careful consideration of related facts pertaining to the area, an estimate of 3,100 ultimate consumers appears to be reasonable.

#### ESTIMATED FUTURE CONSUMPTION; OF ELECTRICITY

This system was energized in 1939. Since 1941, average monthly farm consumption increased from 36 kwh to 241 kwh in 1952. This is an increase of 19 kwh in average monthly usage for each year. For the year ending July 31, 1953, average monthly farm consumption was 253 kwh. Farm consumers indicated that they expect to increase their use of electricity 52 percent by 1956. Nonfarm and town residential consumers indicated an increase of 32 and 27 percent, respectively, during the same period.

Active competition with LP and natural gas, the supply of combustible substitutes for use as fuel, and the inadequacy of some of the lines to carry the necessary load are serious deterrents to future use of electricity in this area. The survey indicated that two-thirds of the future indicated increase for farm and nonfarm consumers will be in active competition with LP and natural gas. Although there is not a plentiful supply of wood in the service area, there appears to be an adequate

19.34

supply of coal, fuel oil, and gas. Respondents in localized rural areas indicated that low voltage is a serious problem.

Based on all factors believed to be significant, this analysis leads to the following monthly kwh estimates which are certified as being reasonable and may be expected to be attained in the years indicated:

		14 1	* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *	•	
	12 Months	Ended			
Class of Consumer	July 31,	1953 / hr /	1955	19 <i>5</i> 8	1963
	•		4. T	+	<del></del>
Farm open	253		310	365	420
Nonfarm Residential	235	FF7.	275	310	320
Town Residential	148		180	215	270
Small Commercial	423		470	510	575
Public Buildings	269		280	290	310
Street and Highway Lights (ann	ual) 11,549	ALFO KI	12,000	12,000	12,000
Irrigation (annual) (20HP)	8,201		10,000	10,000	10,000
Oil Wells (annual) (22HP)	48,492	From St.	50,000	50,000	50,000
· ·			•		
Large Commercial (annual)	KW Demai	nd'			out of the
American Gilsonite	850		1,400,000	1,400,000 1	, 400,000
Rangely Sanitation District	10	? ·	30,000	35,000	40,000
Town of Rangely (Water Dept.			60,000	65,000	70,000
Wesco Refinery	14		25,000	27,000	30,000
Stanolind Oil & Gas Co.	32		110,000	110,000	110,000
Utah Oil Refinery	22		85,000	85,000	85,000
The California Co.	175		600,000	600,000	600,000
Staley Coal Co. Staley Coal	275	***	35,000	35,000	35,000
Artesia Power Co.		t to a	1101	cw 120kw	130kw
Alvesia fonet out	They specify, "	1.	440,000	475,000	525,000

Richard G. Schmitt, Jr. Head, Economic Analysis Section Electric Operations and Loans Division

### ANALYSIS OF BASIC FACTORS RELATED TO THE RURAL ELECTRIFICATION LOAN FOR UTAH 8 DUCHESNE

This analysis of the probable future consumption of electricity by consumers of the Moon Lake Electric Association, Incorporated, with headquarters at Altamont, Utah, (Figure 1), is based on a field study conducted by Vergil Bufford and William B. Kingree, Agricultural Economists, Economic Analysis Section, Electric Operations and Loans Division. This analysis was made by Mr. Kingree. The field work consisted primarily of interviews with 175 served and prospective consumer units. Of these, 74 were served farm consumers, 5 were potential farm consumers, 31 were served nonfarm consumers, 31 were served town consumers, and 34 were served large commercial consumers. In addition, local bankers and agricultural leaders were consulted as to local economic trends and their estimates of the future for the area with respect to the use of electric power.

### ULTIMATE NUMBER OF CONSUMERS

On July 31, 1953, this cooperative was serving a total of 2,428 consumers. The manager has estimated that a total of 3,220 consumers will ultimately receive service (see manager's letter on following page). This is an increase of 33 percent over those presently receiving service. Presumably, the ultimate number includes those consumer units anticipated due to increased habitation in the area as well as those presently served who are expected to remain.

Table VIII shows that the combined total population of Duchesne and Uintah Counties has fluctuated upward during the past 20 years. At the same time the farm population of the two counties and the number of farms therein have been decreasing. The average size of farms has been increasing, which indicates a consolidation of small units into larger and probably more efficient units. On July 31, 1953, the cooperative served a total of 1,470 farm consumers, 186 rural-nonfarm consumers, and had services run, but not connected to 36 farm consumers.

.

F . . . . . 40.

<sup>1/</sup> Farm, nonfarm, and town residential consumers were selected at random and comprise a tabular list sample of consumer units at the following rates: farm consumers 5 percent, nonfarm consumers 17 percent, and town consumers 7 percent.

The results of an unelectrified farm survey completed August 13, 1953 are as follows:

Establishments Serveda/ Potentials	118	2,601
Services Run Not Connected Disconnected	52 12 17	
Abandoned Vacant	96	295
Total		2,896

a/ Possibly more than one establishment per consumer, especially in cases of oil pumps and oil wells.

If the abandoned homes are renovated, occupied, and take service, and if the vacant homes are occupied and take service along with the potential and disconnected consumers, there would be an increment of 243 rural consumers. This would establish a total of 1,935 rural consumers. The manager has estimated that ultimately 2,292 rural consumers, excluding irrigation, will receive service. This figure includes 1,906 farm and 386 rural-nonfarm consumers. The latest power requirement study (February 1952), which does not take into consideration a recent acquisition, indicates that 1,590 farm consumers will be receiving service by 1962.

Table VIII indicates that there are 1,900 farms in the two counties, and there are an undisclosed number of farms in the previously mentioned acquisition.

A consideration of the findings of the unelectrified farm survey and the data presented in Table VIII in conjunction with the manager's estimates tends to support an estimate of 3,100 as ultimate, or the number that might reasonably be expected in 10 years. This estimate is 30 percent less than the manager's estimate of farm consumers to be added in the future.

Consumer Class	Operating: Report 7/31/53	:Power Re-: :quirement:	Manager's : Estimate : of Ultimate:	Number of Ultimate
Farm Nonfarm Residential Fown Residential Small Commercial Large Commercial Irrigation Public St. & Hwy. Ltg. Other Utilities Total	1,470 186 415 310 33 8 4 2 2,428	 1,590 390 500 322 24 48 1 2,875	1,906 386 500 326 53 43 4 2 3,220	1,786 386 500 326 53 43 4 2 3,100

a/ This study was completed in February 1952. Since that date subject system has made an acquisition of existing facilities in a section of Rio Blanco County, Colorado. The acquisition included served town consumers, large and small commercial consumers, public street and highway lighting, and some potential farm and nonfarm consumers.

### NATURE OF PRESENT AND INDICATED FUTURE CONSUMPTION OF ELECTRICITY AS REVEALED BY THE SURVEY

TABLE I

INDICATED MONTHLY KWH CONSUMPTIONS

Consumer Class	Present	Future <u>b</u> /	Percent Increase
Farm — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — —	240	364	52
Nonfarm	226	299	32
Fown Residential	226	286	27
Potential Farm	****	409	and the second

Based on indications by respondents in the survey and average energy requirements as determined by REA on a countrywide basis. Farm consumers in the survey were using electricity at 103 percent of the average rate established by REA on a countrywide basis. Nonfarm consumers were also using 103 percent, while town residential consumers were using about 66 percent of the average.

b/ Based on what respondents expect to add in 3 years.

A comparison of the potential farm consumers' indicated initial average consumption with actual averages in Table II shows that the initial average consumption of these consumers would be about 70 percent greater than the present actual average of respondents in the survey.

Historical consumption records for farm, nonfarm, and town residential consumers in the survey indicate a rising average consumption. This is shown in Tables II and III. Generally, farm and nonfarm consumers added since 1946 have attained higher initial averages than those connected over a longer period. It is evident from Tables I, II, and III that farm and nonfarm consumers are using the average kwh per appliance as determined by REA for the country at large, while the town residential consumption per appliance is below this average.

. Commente propor por TABLE II. the proof of the formation of the first the

### AVERAGE MONTHLY KWH CONSUMPTION OF 91 FARM AND NONFARM CONSUMERS

Total Number of Years With			: .		Aver	age	KWH	Cons	umpt	ion	Per M	onth			
Electricity	:Schedules	:1940	41	142	143	144	145	146	147	148	149	150	151	152	153a/
14 13 12 11 10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2	23 5 2 1 7 3 3 10 5 8	40	43 28 		61 34 35 18	63 41 25 23 79	-67	74	79 46 65 75 313 93	116 60 82 48	133 61 181 99 1162 142	201 84 271 47 1283 177 228 204 67		301 98 290 56	338 113 350 54 1529 291 308 424 64 126 106 205 215 85
Weighted Ar	verage	40	40	53	54	56	67	72	83	120	134	175	206	229	240

a/ Through July.

TABLE III

### AVERAGE MONTHLY KWH CONSUMPTION OF 28 TOWN RESIDENTIAL CONSUMERSa/

Total Number	Number	Average KWH Cons	umption
of Years With	of	Per Month	
Electricity	Schedules	1952b/	1953°
\ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \			
2	20	120	161
1	8		128
	To the property of the		
Weighted Average	ge Managran	120 120	152

This a/ Respondents live in the town of Rangely, Colorado. town was acquired by the cooperative in 1952.

b/ Last 6 months of 1952.

Utah 8 Duchesne - October 19, 1953

A saturation of electrical appliances and equipment measured in terms of the percent of consumers presently having them and a corresponding percent anticipated in the future was compiled from field schedules of presently connected consumers. The difference in saturation, as shown by the increase in percentage points, was converted to future kwh requirements per 100 consumers for each appliance and piece of equipment. This tabulation is shown in Table IV.

### PHYSICAL CHARACTERISTICS

The major part of the service area is located in northeastern Utah, in Duchesne and Uintah Counties. It also extends into the western part of Rio Blanco County, Colorado. The topography of the area is characterized by arid basin lands interspersed with mountain ranges, hills, benchlands, and rolling plains, both smooth and broken, with considerable irrigated and irrigable land. Generally, surface drainage is adequate. In localized areas, however, runoff water has cut deep gullies in the land. The soils range from gravelly loam on the mesas, or benchlands, to silty clay loam on the lower elevations. Average annual precipitation in Duchesne and Uintah Counties is 9.4 inches. The growing season averages 124 days.

### ECONOMIC CHARACTERISTICS

During the period 1930-1950, the combined total population of Duchesne and Uintah Counties increased by about 7 percent. The farm population during this period decreased by approximately 25 percent, while the nonfarm population increased by 12 percent.

About 35 percent of the land area in the two counties was classified as farm land in 1950. Of the total farm acreage, 86 percent was classified as land used for pasture. About 50 percent of the total land area of the two counties is either in national forest or Indian reservation lands. Part of the remaining land area is public domain and part of it is wasteland.

From 1945-1950, the number of farms in the two counties decreased by 5 percent, while the average size of farms increased by 54 percent. The average value of land and buildings in 1950 was \$15,762, as compared with \$8,936 in 1945. Compared with the State of Utah, the two counties in 1950 had 14 percent more of the land area in farms, an 18 percent lower valuation of land and buildings, and about a 400 percent greater average size of farms.

Average gross farm income in the two counties was \$2,626 in 1944 and \$3,960 in 1949, as compared with the Utah State average of \$3,669 in 1944 and \$5,389 in 1949. In 1949, the sale of livestock and livestock products accounted for 85 percent of the farm income in the two counties, as compared with 92 percent in 1944. Of the income from the sale of livestock and livestock products in 1949, 30 percent in Duchesne County, as compared with 16 percent in Uintah County, was derived from the sale of poultry and poultry products and dairy products. Sale of forest products accounted for less than 1 percent of the farm income in 1949. Receipts from crops accounted for the remainder of the income in both counties in 1949.

the property available of the

, \* · ; · · ·

17 17 17 17 17 18 

AND

AND INDICATED SATURATION OF ELECTRICAL APPLIANCES EQUIPMENT AND CORRESPONDING INDICATED INCREASE IN KWH

PRESENT

6 (1) 4 \* \* \* 1.27\* W 2003 3. Acc

The state of the s

TABLE 1V

254  $f(t) \in \mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}}$ 

100

WATER COST CONTROL CON	NOREASEB/ INGREASEB/ RECOLLED	14,000 13 13 14,000 14,000 15 16 17 17 18 18 19 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	
CONSUMERS	TOWN RESIDENT		
M AND TOWN RESIDENTIAL	INCREASEB/ SKWH USAGE	2	ation District Maria
USAGE FARM, NONFARM	FARM AND NONE	$-\frac{1}{3} - \frac{1}{1} \cdot \frac{1}{2} \cdot \frac{1}{4} \cdot \frac{1}{6} \cdot 1$	CVV COVV COVV
Silver Silver Silver	APPLIANCE	ADDING MACHINE AIR CONDITIONING UNIT AIR COMPRESSOR ANIMAL GLIPPER BATTERY CHARGER BATTERY CHARGER BATTERY CHARGER BROODER (HOVER) CLOCK CLOTHES DRIER COAL STOKER COAL STOKER COAL STOKER COAL STOKER COAL STOKER COAL STOKER COAL CEPRESS EGG BOILER FAN (HOUSEHOLD) FAN (HOUSE) FEED MIXER FORGE FREEZER (HOME) GARBAGE DISPOSAL GARBAGE DISPOSAL GARBAGE DISPOSAL	

PERCENT
PRESENTLY: INDICATING USING FUTURE USE
1000
36 36
10
2 2
1
<b>v</b> 0
- a
12
7
6
2 2
20 31
2
31 41
7 2
-
4 1 1 2 N
- quera
20 29
23 31 96 100
•

APPLIANCE OR OR OR RANGE RAZOR REFRIGERATOR ROASIER SANDWICH GRILL SEWING MACHINE SOLDERING IRON SPACE HEATER (PORTABLE) STOCK TANK DEICER	PRESENTLY: 10: USING : FI	CONSUMERSA!	INCREASEB	L I	PERCENT OF	F CONSUMERS	z i	: INCREASED : KWH : PERCENTAGE: PER	H USAGE
ERATOR CH GRILL MACHINE ING IRON HEATER (PORTABLE	38 38		O TO A TIME O CE	PED 100 . DOFERNY	; <b>&gt;</b>	- INDICATING			
RANGE RAZOR REFRIGERATOR ROASTER SANDWICH GRILL SEWING MACHINE SOLDERING IRON SPACE HEATER (PORTABLE) STOCK TANK DEICER	38	UTURE USE ::	POINTS		3,:	FUTURE USE	• • • •	POINTS : CC	CONSUMERS
RAZOR RAZOR RAZOR ROAS,TER SANDWICH GRILL SEWING MACHINE SOLDERING IRON SPACE HEATER (PORTABLE) STOCK TANK DEICER	o —	7	a -	002 16					3.32 \$ 25.5
REFRIGERATOR ROASIER SANDWICH GRILL SEWING MACHINE SOLDERING IRON SPACE HEATER (PORTABLE) STOCK TANK DEICER	_	o -	<u> </u>	0000	2 4	<u>n</u> (		י. ח	2,000
ROASTER SANDWICH GRILL SEWING MACHINE SOLDERING IRON SPACE HEATER (PORTABLE) STOCK TANK DEICER	06	63	m	1.080		06			3.240
SANDWICH GRILL SEWING MACHINE SOLDERING IRON SPACE HEATER (PORTABLE) STOCK TANK DEICER	=	-	1	1	'n	m)	i		
SEWING MACHINE SOLDERING IRON SPACE HEATER (PORTABLE) STOCK TANK DEICER	<u>.</u>			1	Ť	1	1		
SOLDERING IRON SPACE HEATER (PORTABLE) STOCK TANK DEICER	<b>5</b> 8	 JE	<u>ო</u> -%	30	29	32	***	·	9
SPACE HEATER (PORTABLE) STOCK TANK DEICER	0	- 2	2 2	30	f	ľ	1	100 miles	.1
STOCK TANK DEICER	~	o-	2,1	<b>1</b> 40	9	9	-		1
	1	<u>.</u>		1 50	Ť	Î	1		ľ
STOCK TANK HEATER	eri Laure	9	ें. ज	750	1	1	1		
TELEYISION RECEIVER	1	<u>_</u>	<del>-</del>	··· 360	1	1	1	,	.
TOASTER	55	8	ო :	⊶102	74~	74.	***	e.	105
INDER	61	23	4	100	m	m m	1		
VACUUM CLEANER	<b>3</b> 6	49	01.	~~500	48-	55.		_	140
VENTILATOR (VINDOW)	I	1	1	1	9	9	1	1	1.
VI BRATOR		,	-	1 . 7	ł	1	i	1 1 1	1
WAFFLE IRON	43	46	ന	75	10	19	1		1
WASHING MACHINE	87	26	വ	: 175	65	න <sup>.</sup>		ო	105
WATER HEATER WITH BATH	17	<b>3</b> 6.	61	27,000	58	32		m	000 6
WATER HEATER WITHOUT BATH	W.	5	ო :	7.,200	ന്ദ്വ.	ന	1		1
CATER HEATER		•	. • •	*	••				
(PRESSURE TYPE)	įo	1	<b>7</b>	4 000 d	Ì	I	į		: [
VELDER	Ø	1.4	: ح	375	†·	F			1
WOOD, SAW	N	'n	1	}	†	†	1		
	motors for g		,	* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *	Ġ,	É		3	

THESE CASES ARE RARE AND DO NOT AFFECT THE OVER-ALL PATTERN The second secon B/ BASED ON AVERAGE ENERGY REQUIREMENTS DETERMINED BY REA. OF THE SAME APPLIANCE EXIST PER CONSUMER. MAT ER! ALLY.

1;;.

A/ BASED ON INDICATIONS OF PRESENTLY COMNECTED CONSUMERS.

Utah 8 Duchesne - October 19, 1953

eg will be eller to the eller

Farms reporting livestock in both counties in 1950 had averages of 36 cattle, 6 hogs, 230 sheep, 64 chickens, and 5 horses. Generally, ranch-type enterprises predominate throughout the service area; in localized areas, however, dairy and poultry farming is very important. Although livestock farming predominates, production of field crops is important. Average yields per acre for the major crops in the two counties in 1949 were: hay 2 tons, oats 40 bushels, barley 42 bushels, spring wheat 30 bushels, winter wheat 22 bushels, and corn 34 bushels. These yields are comparable to those of the State for 1949. In 1949, ditch irrigation was used in the production of all crops and about 5 percent of the pasture.

In 1950, 63 percent of the farms in the two counties were owned in full or in part. In 1945, 91 percent of the farm operators, as compared with 92 percent in 1950, resided on the farm they operated. Fifty-five percent of the farmers in 1949, as compared with 41 percent in 1944 reported working off the farm, while 31 percent in 1949, as compared with 24 percent in 1944, reported working 100 or more days off the farm. About 32 percent of the operators reported other income of the family exceeding the value of farm products sold in 1949.

In 1950, 55 percent of the farms had one or more trucks, 51 percent had one or more tractors, and 65 percent had one or more automobiles.

Thirty-eight percent of the farms in the two counties are located alongside a hard-surfaced or gravel road. An average distance of 8 miles to a trading center was reported, with 51 percent of the farms being less than 5 miles from such center.

Opportunity for nonfarm employment is afforded by local business establishments within the service area, and by the lumber, coal mining, and oil industries operating in or near the area.

Deposits of phosphate, ilsemannite, copper, iron ore, lead, silver, gold, asphalt, coal, oil, and gas have been reported in the area. Asphalt, oil, and gas are produced commercially.

According to banks visited in the area, the ratio of deposits to loans is 2.2 to 1.0. Bank officials estimated that farmers owned 50 percent of the demand deposits, and that between one-half and two-thirds of the banks' loans were to farmers. Supervisors of the Farmers' Home Administration Offices reported a total of 280 loans outstanding in the two counties. These loans averaged \$4,693 each.

#### ANALYSIS OF FUTURE CONSUMPTION

This system was energized in 1939. Since 1941, average monthly farm consumption increased from 36 kwh to 241 kwh in 1952. This is an increase of 19 kwh in average monthly usage for each year. For the year ending July 31, 1953, average monthly farm consumption was 253 kwh. Table II shows that new consumers are generally being added at levels of consumption of approximately four times that of the initial consumption of the earlier consumers.

If farm consumption is to increase at the rate indicated in Table I, we might expect an average monthly farm figure of 385 kwh (253 x 1.52). The average monthly nonfarm figure would be 310 kwh (235 x 1.32), and the average monthly town residential figure would be 188 kwh (148 x 1.27). To achieve these increases, the specific additional kwh resulting from indicated future saturation of appliances and equipment as shown in Table IV must be attained.

Approximately 87 percent of the indicated increased use for farm and nonfarm consumers would need to occur in the household (Table V). Moreover, 80 percent of this indicated increase would need to occur as a result of the addition of water heaters, ranges, and home freezers. About four-fifths of the indicated use for major productive items would need to occur on dairy and poultry farms.

INDICATED AND ESTIMATED KWH USAGE, FARM AND NONFARM
CONSUMERS BY CHARACTER OF LOAD PER 100 CONSUMERS

Indicated   Future   Indicated   Indicat		·					<del></del>
Major Household Uses   Water Heater	b	Indicated		Percent of	Let Market		Estimated
Major Household Uses  Mater Heater Mater Heater Mater Heater Mage Mage Mater Heater Mage Mage Mater Heater Mage Mage Mater Heater Mage Mage Mage Mage Mage Mage Mage Mage	Use	Future	Indicated	Indicated	Estimated	Present	Future
Major Household Uses  Water Heater 41 65,879 49.1 32,940 57,536 90,476 Range 56 22,372 16.7 13,423 47,092 60,515 Home Freezer 50 19,467 14.5 17,520 26,512 44,032 Clothes Drier 9 3,461 2.6 3,115 2,740 5,855 Pressure System (Greater than 22') 31 1,879 1.4 1,597 5,883 7,480 Pressure System (Less than 22') 29 1,594 1.2 1,355 3,708 5,063 Refrigerator 93 1,409 1.0 1,268 33,557 34,825  Major Productive Uses 13,964 10.4 11,869 38,379 50,248 All Other Uses 4,153 3.1 3,530 76,232 79,762 Total 134,178 100.0  Estimated annual average increase (total) in kwh consumption per 100 consumers - 1956 Estimated annual average increase (total) in kwh consumption per consumer - 1956 3,783 Estimated monthly average increase (total) over a	}	Saturation	Increase	Increase	Increase	Use	Total
Water Heater 41 65,879 49.1, 32,940 57,536 90,476 Range 56 22,372 16.7 13,423 47,092 60,515 Home Freezer 50 19,467 14.5 17,520 26,512 44,032 Clothes Drier 9 3,461 2.6 3,115 2,740 5,855 Pressure System (Greater than 22') 31 1,879 1.4 1,597 5,883 7,480 Pressure System (Less than 22') 29 1,594 1.2 1,355 3,708 5,063 Refrigerator 93 1,409 1.0 1,268 33,557 34,825  Major Productive Uses — 13,964 10.4 11,869 38,379 50,248 All Other Uses — 4,153 3.1 3,530 76,232 79,762  Total 134,178 100.0  Estimated annual average increase (total) in kwh consumption per 100 consumers — 1956 Estimated annual average increase (total) in kwh consumption per consumer — 1956 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	. ,						
Water Heater       41       65,879       49.1       32,940       57,536       90,476         Range       56       22,372       16.7       13,423       47,092       60,515         Home Freezer       50       19,467       14.5       17,520       26,512       44,032         Clothes Drier       9       3,461       2.6       3,115       2,740       5,855         Pressure System       (Greater than 22')       31       1,879       1.4       1,597       5,883       7,480         Pressure System       (Less than 22')       29       1,594       1.2       1,355       3,708       5,063         Refrigerator       93       1,409       1.0       1,268       33,557       34,825         Major Productive Uses        13,964       10.4       11,869       38,379       50,248         All Other Uses        4,153       3.1       3,530       76,232       79,762         Total       134,178       100.0       86,617        378,256         Estimated annual average increase (total) in kwh consumption per consumer - 1956       866        3,783         Estimated monthly average increase (total) over a	Major Household Us	ses			Karaman da k		100
Range 56 22,372 16.7 13,423 47,092 60,515 Home Freezer 50 19,467 14.5 17,520 26,512 44,032 Clothes Drier 9 3,461 2.6 3,115 2,740 5,855 Pressure System   (Greater than 22') 31 1,879 1.4 1,597 5,883 7,480 Pressure System   (Less than 22') 29 1,594 1.2 1,355 3,708 5,063 Refrigerator 93 1,409 1.0 1,268 33,557 34,825  Major Productive Uses - 13,964 10.4 11,869 38,379 50,248 All Other Uses - 4,153 3.1 3,530 76,232 79,762  Total 134,178 100.0  Estimated annual average increase (total) in kwh consumption per 100 consumers - 1956 Estimated annual average increase (total) in kwh consumption per consumer - 1956 Estimated monthly average increase (total) over a			65,879	49.1	32,940	57,536	90,476
Rome Freezer   50   19,467   14.5   17,520   26,512   44,032     Clothes Drier   9   3,461   2.6   3,115   2,740   5,855     Pressure System   (Greater than 22')   31   1,879   1.4   1,597   5,883   7,480     Pressure System   (Less than 22')   29   1,594   1.2   1,355   3,708   5,063     Refrigerator   93   1,409   1.0   1,268   33,557   34,825     Major Productive Uses   - 13,964   10.4   11,869   38,379   50,248     All Other Uses   - 4,153   3.1   3,530   76,232   79,762     Total   134,178   100.0     Estimated annual average increase (total) in kwh consumption per 100 consumers - 1956   86,617   - 378,256     Estimated annual average increase (total) in kwh consumption per consumer - 1956   866   - 3,783     Estimated monthly average increase (total) over a				16.7	13,423		60.515
Clothes Drier 9 3,461 2.6 3,115 2,740 5,855  Pressure System (Greater than 22') 31 1,879 1.4 1,597 5,883 7,480  Pressure System (Less than 22') 29 1,594 1.2 1,355 3,708 5,063  Refrigerator 93 1,409 1.0 1,268 33,557 34,825  Major Productive Uses 13,964 10.4 11,869 38,379 50,248  All Other Uses 4,153 3.1 3,530 76,232 79,762  Total 134,178 100.0  Estimated annual average increase (total) in kvh con- sumption per 100 consumers - 1956  Estimated annual average increase (total) in kvh con- sumption per consumer - 1956 378,256  Estimated monthly average increase (total) over a	Home Freezer	50		14.5	17.520	26,512	. 44,032
Pressure System (Greater than 22') 31 1,879 1.4 1,597 5,883 7,480 Pressure System (Less than 22') 29 1,594 1.2 1,355 3,708 5,063 Refrigerator 93 1,409 1.0 1,268 33,557 34,825  Major Productive Uses 13,964 10.4 11,869 38,379 50,248  All Other Uses 4,153 3.1 3,530 76,232 79,762  Total 134,178 100.0  Estimated annual average increase (total) in kwh consumption per 100 consumers - 1956 Estimated annual average increase (total) in kwh consumption per consumer - 1956 378,256  Estimated monthly average increase (total) over a		9 346	3,461	.2.6	3, 115		11 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1
(Greater than 22') 31 1,879 1.4 1,597 5,883 7,480  Pressure System (Less than 22') 29 1,594 1.2 1,355 3,708 5,063  Refrigerator 93 1,409 1.0 1,268 33,557 34,825  Major Productive Uses 13,964 10.4 11,869 38,379 50,248  All Other Uses 4,153 3.1 3,530 76,232 79,762  Total 134,178 100.0  Estimated annual average increase (total) in kwh consumption per 100 consumers - 1956  Estimated annual average increase (total) in kwh consumption per consumer - 1956 378,256  Estimated monthly average increase (total) over a		<u> </u>		· .		• •	
Pressure System    (Less than 22') 29 1,594 1.2 1,355 3,708 5,063 Refrigerator 93 1,409 1.0 1,268 33,557 34,825  Major Productive Uses 13,964 10.4 11,869 38,379 50,248  All Other Uses 4,153 3.1 3,530 76,232 79,762  Total 134,178 100.0  Estimated annual average increase (total) in kwh con- sumption per 100 consumers - 1956  Estimated annual average increase (total) in kwh con- sumption per consumer - 1956 86,617 378,256  Estimated monthly average increase (total) over a	_	221) 31	1.879	1.4	1,597	5.883	7,480
(Less than 22¹) 29 1,594 1.2 1,355 3,708 5,063 Refrigerator 93 1,409 1.0 1,268 33.557 34,825  Major Productive Uses 13,964 10.4 11,869 38,379 50,248  All Other Uses 4,153 3.1 3,530 76,232 79,762  Total 134,178 100.0  Estimated annual average increase (total) in kwh consumption per 100 consumers - 1956  Estimated annual average increase (total) in kwh consumption per consumer - 1956 3,783  Estimated monthly average increase (total) over a		- Total 3.	\$4.E	1.0		7.7.	
Refrigerator       93       1,409       1.0       1,268       33,557       34,825         Major Productive Uses       -       13,964       10.4       11,869       38,379       50,248         All Other Uses       -       4,153       3.1       3,530       76,232       79,762         Total       134,178       100.0         Estimated annual average increase (total) in kwh consumption per l00 consumers - 1956       86,617       -       378,256         Estimated annual average increase (total) in kwh consumption per consumer - 1956       866       -       3,783         Estimated monthly average increase (total) over a		1) 29	1.594	1.2	1.355	3.708:	5,063
Major Productive Uses - 13,964 10.4 11,869 38,379 50,248  All Other Uses - 4,153 3.1 3,530 76,232 79,762  Total 134,178 100.0  Estimated annual average increase (total) in kwh consumption per 100 consumers - 1956  Estimated annual average increase (total) in kwh consumption per consumer - 1956 - 378,256  Estimated monthly average increase (total) over a		93		1.0		- • •	
All Other Uses — 4,153 3.1 3,530 76,232 79,762  Total 134,178 100.0  Estimated annual average increase (total) in kwh con— sumption per 100 consumers — 1956  Estimated annual average increase (total) in kwh con— sumption per consumer — 1956 — 3,783  Estimated monthly average increase (total) over a				D 6 14 3		_	
Estimated annual average increase (total) in kwh consumption per 100 consumers - 1956  Estimated annual average increase (total) in kwh consumption per consumer - 1956  Sumption per consumer - 1956  Estimated monthly average increase (total) over a	Major Productive I		- • •	10.4	11,869	38,379	50,248
Estimated annual average increase (total) in kwh consumption per 100 consumers - 1956  Estimated annual average increase (total) in kwh consumption per consumer - 1956  Sumption per consumer - 1956  Estimated monthly average increase (total) over a	All Other Uses	en e	4,153	3 <b>.1</b> (1)	Toyara - 3, 530	76,232	79,762
Estimated annual average increase (total) in kwh con- sumption per 100 consumers - 1956  Estimated annual average increase (total) in kwh con- sumption per consumer - 1956  Estimated monthly average increase (total) over a		1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	`	2 90			
Estimated annual average increase (total) in kwh consumption per consumer - 1956  Estimated monthly average increase (total) over a  86,617  378,256  86,617  378,256  3,783	Total			100.0			* * :
Estimated annual average increase (total) in kwh consumption per consumer - 1956  Estimated monthly average increase (total) over a  86,617  378,256  86,617  378,256  3,783	Estimated annual	STANGE OF THE	Self ( total )	in but con		and the same	
Estimated annual average increase (total) in kwh con- sumption per consumer - 1956 and 866  Estimated monthly average increase (total) over a	•		to a c	III KWII COIL	86 612	14. 1.08.119	378 256
Estimated monthly average increase (total) over a	sumption per roo	= aremoanoo c	1900 3	. 771.13	7700,017		. 310,230
Estimated monthly average increase (total) over a	Estimated annual a	average increa	se (total)	in kwh con-	P growning in		
Estimated monthly average increase (total) over a				3.	AW 47 866	A America	3,783
Estimated monthly average increase (total) over a	· · ·				alled the line		
1-Vear Deritor - 1951-1956 // 115	_		ase (total)	over a		1.4	27.5
	J-year period	1953-1950			12	#10 413	315

a/ Adjusted. Appliance usage and amount of electricity is 103 percent of the average for the United States as determined by REA.

Utah 8 Duchesne - October 19, 1953

Table VI shows that 70 percent of the farm consumers in the survey indicated they were using electricity at a monthly rate of 120 or more kwh. Of the consumers represented by the groups using 120 or more kwh monthly, 77 percent indicated they intended to increase their monthly consumption by an average of 179 kwh each per month during the next 3 years. Although the ratio of indicated monthly consumption to indicated monthly increase is greater in the lower consumption groups, the average monthly increase for these groups is much lower than the increase for the higher consumption groups. If all farm consumers in the system area follow the pattern for increasing consumption indicated by those farm consumers in the survey, 70 percent will be using 200 or more kwh monthly at the end of 3 years. These data may have some significance in reviewing the present rate structure and in devising new rate schedules for future use on this system.

TABLE VI

ANALYSIS OF PRESENT AND FUTURE INDICATED CONSUMPTION:
DISTRIBUTION OF CONSUMERS AND RELATION OF PROPOSED
TO PRESENT USAGE ACCORDING TO RATE BLOCKE

	-	: Percent Of	Percent Of All Consumers After	Indicate		Indicated Increase
	Percent		:Increases Have	· ·	:Indicated:	
Rate	:Of All	:Indicating	:Taken Place (End		:Monthly	•
Block	:Consumer	s:An Increase	e:Of 3-Year Period)	):sumption	:Increase b	Present Us
					;	
nder 40 kw	h 2.7	50.0	1.4	38	15	39.5
	th 2.7	50.0 42.9	1.4 6.8	<b>3</b> 8 <b>6</b> 9	1 <i>5</i> 81	39.5
40-80 kw		_		38 69 97	1 <i>5</i> 81 106	117.4
40-80 kw	7h: 9.5 7h: 17.6	42.9	6.8	69	8 <u>1</u> 106	117.4
40 - 80 kw 80-120 kw	7h: 9.5 7h: 17.6 7h 28.4	42.9 69.2	6.8 10.8	69 97	81	117.4
40 – 80 kw 80 – 120 kw 120 – 200 kw	7h 9.5 7h 17.6 7h 28.4 7h 24.3	42.9 69.2 61.9	6.8 10.8 12.1	69 97 167	81 106 1 <i>5</i> 8	117.4 109.2 94.6

Based on all farm consumers in the survey.

D Includes all farm consumers in the survey.

There are other factors which must be considered in arriving at estimates of electric consumption. Among these are (1) the extent to which LP and natural gas competition is likely to reduce the indicated future increases in electrical usage, (2) the supply of substitutes for use as fuel for cooking and heating water, (3) the adequacy of rural lines to carry the necessary load, and (4) the extent to which other related economic trends are likely to have their impact upon the indicated future consumption.

And are Walter Free Deligible 1985 and pathological programme in the lates

#### that be a subsequent and provide as TABLE VII with about specific property and and are

# THE PARTY TYPES OF STATUS OF LP AND NATURAL CAS USE: 130 RESPONDENTS STATUS OF LP AND NATURAL CAS USE: 130 RESPONDENTS STATUS REPORTING IN RANDOM SAMPLE SURVEY®/

Alleger of the state of the sta

and the days and the

Consumers! Position With Respect to Use of Gas	: Number in Survey :: Percent of To :Farm and: Town :: Farm and: Tow :: Nonfarm : Reside	n
Not using and not planning to use Not using but planning to use Using LP gas Using natural gas	2 — 2.0 17 — 17.2 — 30 — 9	3.2 
Used For: Cooking Water Heating Refrigeration	13 25 13.1 8 6 10 6.1 3	0.0 0.6 2.3 2.9
House Heating of the state of t	The Experimental State of the Control of the Contro	4.2
Not planning to change to electricity in the future (3 years).  Planning to change to electricity in the future if electric service improv	15 30 15.2 9	6.8

a/ All served farm, nonfarm, and town residential respondents indicating use of gas.

A 7 99 A 7 15 C

The Charles of the production of the production of the contraction of

A Milliage Co. Table VII indicates that about 17 percent of the farm and nonfarm and 97 percent of the town residential consumers are presently using LP or natural gas for one or more purposes. One percent of the farm and nonfarm consumers indicated their intention to change to electricity in the future and I percent indicated they had tentative plans to dispose of their gas appliances, while 2 percent not now using gas indicated they planned to do so in the future. Two-thirds of the future indicated increase for farm and nonfarm consumers will be in active competition with LP gas. Of the five potential consumers, three were using LP gas and two of the three indicated that they planned to change to electricity when central station service becomes available.

b/ Three respondents indicated that they were planning to dispose of only certain gas appliances. . a 04 900

Utah 8 Duchesne - October 19, 1953

The retail rate schedule in effect at the time of the appraisal is as follows:

SCHEDULE A. Farm and Home Service

First 30 kwh, or less, per month \$2.70 (minimum)

Next 30 kwh per month @ 4.0¢ per kwh

Next 40 kwh per month @ 3.0¢ per kwh

Next 100 kwh per month @ 2.0¢ per kwh

Over 200 kwh per month @ 1.5¢ per kwh

Special Service for Small Farms and Homes SCHEDULE C. Having a Demand of Not Over 15 Amperes
First 16 kwh, or less, per month \$1.50 (minimum)
All over 16 kwh per month @ 9.0¢ per kwh

SCHEDULE B. Commercial and Small Power Service
First 30 kwh, or less, per month \$2.70 (minimum)
Next 30 kwh per month \$4.0¢ per kwh
Next 40 kwh per month \$3.0¢ per kwh
Next 2900 kwh per month \$2.5¢ per kwh
Over 3000 kwh per month \$2.0¢ per kwh

SCHEDULE E. Service to Schools, Churches and Community Halls

First 30 kwh per month @ 9.0¢ per kwh

Next 30 kwh per month @ 4.0¢ per kwh

Next 30 kwh per month @ 3.0¢ per kwh

Next 900 kwh per month @ 2.5¢ per kwh

Over 1000 kwh per month @ 1.5¢ per kwh

Minimum charge - \$18.00 per year

SCHEDULE A-R. Residential Service Rangely

First 50 kwh per month @ 9.0¢ per kwh

Next 50 kwh per month @ 5.0¢ per kwh

Next 100 kwh per month @ 3.0¢ per kwh

Over 200 kwh per month @ 2.0¢ per kwh

Minimum charge - \$2.70 per month

For separately metered service to water

heaters conforming to specifications-1.5¢ per kwh

SCHEDULE B-R. Commercial and Small Power Service-Rangely

First 50 kwh per month @ 9.0¢ per kwh

Next 50 kwh per month @ 7.0¢ per kwh

Next 200 kwh per month @ 5.0¢ per kwh

Next 1000 kwh per month @ 4.0¢ per kwh

Next 1700 kwh per month @ 3.0¢ per kwh

Over 3000 kwh per month @ 2.0¢ per kwh

Minimum charge - \$2.70 per month

SCHEDULE LP - Large Power Service

\$2.30 per month per kw of billing demand for the first 100 kw \$1.80 per month per kw of billing demand for all over 100 kw

Plus energy charges of ....

2.0¢ per kwh for the first 100 kwh used per month per kw of billing demand  $1.5\phi$  per kwh for the next 100 kwh used per month per kw of billing demand

0.65¢ per kwh for all remaining kwh used per month.

The minimum monthly charge shall be the highest one of the following charges as determined for the consumer in question.

(1) The minimum monthly charge specified in the contract for service.

(2) A charge of \$0.75 per KVA of installed transformer capacity.

(3) A charge of \$25.00.

Street Lighting

Dologo Highwing		
Incandescent lamps, burning from dusk to dawn		
250 c.p. series lamps, per lamp, per year \$33.00		
200 watt multiple lamps, per lamp, per year \$39.00		
150 watt multiple lamps, per lamp, per year \$33.00		
100 watt multiple lamps, per lamp, per year \$27.00		
Mercury vapor lamps, ornamental, burning from dusk to dawn		
400 watt, mercury vapor lamp, per unit, per year \$78.00		
400 watt, mercury vapor lamp, per unit, per year \$78.00		

Additional use of electricity resulting from ranges and water heaters depends on the supply of combustible substitutes in the area. Although there is not a plentiful supply of wood in the area, there appears to be an adequate supply of coal, fuel oil, and gas. Another factor affecting use of electricity is low voltage and the frequency of outages on some of the lines. Respondents in localized rural areas indicated that low voltage is a serious problem. One respondent indicated that she kept a gas stove on standby status for use when the electric range was inoperative due to low voltage. In order to alleviate these conditions, it appears that it may be necessary to rephase some of the lines. It is unreasonable to assume that these respondents will add new appliances or equipment while they are unable to obtain maximum use from those appliances or pieces of equipment which are presently connected.

From Table VIII, trends in the area relative to the State indicate the service area to be increasing slightly in importance both absolutely and relatively. During the past two decades, the population of the area has increased slightly. At the same time there has been a decrease in the number of farms in the area. This is probably due to consolidation of smaller units into larger enterprises. Somewhat more favorable is the relation of average farm income and average value of land and buildings in the area as compared with the State.

Out of the production of the production of the state of t

### TABLE VIII

## TRENDS RELATED TO THE RATE OF INCREASE IN USE OF ELECTRIC POWER

Item and Relationship	Trend	
Population Duchesne County Uintah County Counties Combined State of Utah Ratio Area to State	%Change 1920 1930 1920-30 1940 9,093 8,263 - 9.1 8,958 8,470 9,035 \$\frac{1}{4}\$ 6.7 9,898 17,563 17,298 - 1.5 18,856 449,396 507,847 \$\frac{1}{4}\$13.0 550,310 039 034 - 034	%Change
Number of Farms 1930 197  Duchesne County 1,050 1,20  Uintah County 1,076 1,39  Counties Combined 2,126 2,59  State of Utah 27,159 30,69  Ratio Area to State .078 .08	$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	-5.4 947 -9.2 -15.3 953 \( \dagger 0.2
Average Income From All Farm Products Sold Duchesne County Uintah County Combined Average State of Utah Ratio Area to State		1939 1944 1949 \$ 949 \$2,608 \$4,026 1,058 2,646 3,894 1,004 2,627 3,960 1,569 3,669 5,389 .64 .72 .73
Average Value of Land and Buildings Duchesne County Uintah County Combined Average State of Utah Ratio Area to State		1940 1945 1950 \$3,197 7,249 \$18,203 4,269 \$10,662 13,321 3,733 8,956 15,762 6,074 9,947 19,146 .61 .90 .82

The second of the second

DENNAME OF SECTION OF

**强性等的性,**从一面一点。 A STATE OF THE STATE OF and the second second

The first of the property of the property of the page of the page

Considering the present use and probable continued use of LP and natural gas in the service area, the supply of wood and coal for use as fuel, the reported low voltage on some of the lines, and the general observation that, on a countrywide basis, respondents' indications in the past regarding future usage of electricity have been optimistic, the attainment of the indicated consumption within a 3-year period appears to be unlikely at this time. On the basis of these and related factors, it is estimated that within 3 years 50 percent of the indicated increase for water heaters will be attained. It is also expected that 60 percent of the indicated increase attributed to ranges, 90 percent to home freezers, clothes driers, and refrigerators, and 85 percent to major productive uses, pressure systems, and all other uses will be realized. Kilowatt-hour increases at these rates are shown in Table V.

Bernata Bernata Tarenak Tarenak

The first and the control of the con

- 16 -



